

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

The drawings are objected to for failing to show “a longitudinal center line” of a coil.

Claims 1 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite.

Claims 1 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0184489 (“Maruyama”) in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2006/0022886 (“Hein”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,338 (“Mejia”).

### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants cancel claims 1 – 5 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amend claim 6 to define the claimed subject matter further. Support for these amendments is found in at least Fig. 3D and from the last full paragraph of page 4 through the second full paragraph of page 5 of the specification as originally filed (corresponding to paragraphs [0014] – [0016] of the published application). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132.

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because it (a) places the application in prima facie condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration by the Examiner because similar subject matter was previously considered by the Examiner and thus further consideration and/or search by the Examiner is not warranted; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Applicants respectfully request

entry of the present Amendment, and reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

**The Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to for failing to show “a longitudinal center line” of a coil. Applicants amend the claims to remove reference to “a longitudinal center line,” and respectfully request the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that it is unclear what “pattern wire” means and that it is unclear how the pattern wire is arranged relative to the coil. Applicants cancel claims 1 – 5 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amend independent claim 6 to recite in part “a pattern wire passing in parallel to a center line of the coil.” The claimed pattern wire refers to pattern wire 4a of Fig. 3D as disclosed in, for example, the last full paragraph of page 4 of the original application (paragraph [0013] of the published application), which discloses that pattern wire 4a passes “parallel to a center line of the coil.”

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 6 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants further submit that claims 7 – 10, which depend from claim 6, are also allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not narrow the intended scope of the claims, and therefore Applicants do not relinquish any subject matter by the amendments. For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Maruyama in view Hein, further in view of Mejia. Applicants disagree, and respectfully submit that the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the amended claim features, nor would a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field be prompted to combine the cited prior art in the manner claimed.

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should “identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements” in the manner claimed. *KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). Furthermore, even if the prior art may be combined, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Here, Applicants cancel claims 1 – 5 without prejudice or disclaimer (rendering rejection of these claims moot), and amend independent claim 6 to recite in part:

- a controller formed on a side of a vehicle;
- a communicating section connected with the controller; and
- a connector attached to one end of the embedded antenna, the connector facilitating connection of the embedded antenna to a power circuit and the communicating section.

Neither Maruyama, Hein, nor Mejia disclose these features. Thus, even if the cited references were combined with a reasonable expectation of success, the combined references would not disclose or suggest all the claim features of amended independent claim 6. These references are cited as allegedly teaching other features of the claimed subject matter, but none of the features identified above. Accordingly, the cited prior art, alone or combined, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 6. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field would not have been prompted to combine the cited prior art in the manner claimed.

Since none of the other art of record, alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 6 is allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 7 – 10 are also allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 6, and that the rejection of claims 1 – 5 is moot. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

# # # #

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
**THE NATH LAW GROUP**

Date: September 22, 2010

/Jerald L. Meyer/

**THE NATH LAW GROUP**  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891  
Tel: 703-548-6284  
Fax: 703-683-8396

---

Jerald L. Meyer  
Registration No. 41,194  
Derek Richmond  
Registration No. 45,771  
Robert T. Burns  
Registration No. 60,545  
**Customer No. 20529**